

I therefore see no escape from the conclusion that ten *krors* is the right figure ; that the estimates of Nizam-ud-din and Abul Fazl agree ; and that the *murádi tankah* is neither the one-fifth of a *dám* mentioned in the *Ain* nor the modern “double pyce,” but an imaginary integer of copper accounts whereof sixty-four equal one silver Rupee. I conclude, farther, that this sum was increased, by the end of the reign, to about twelve *krors*; that increase being due to good settlements and a firm administration. Of course my conclusion is wholly inconsistent with the complaint of Sir R. Temple (*India in 1880*) that the British get no more out of the empire than the Mughals did. But that is a complaint which would, as I imagine, be endorsed by very few persons who were acquainted with the facts.

~~~~~

*On the Identity of Upello with Upaplava.*—By RISHI KESH  
BHAṬṬĀCHĀRYA SHĀSTRÍ.

With reference to a letter which was sent a few days ago by the Deputy Commissioner, Delhi, asking about the site of the city of Upello or (the correct word) Upaplava mentioned in the *Viráṭaparva*, *Mahábhárata*, I beg to submit the following which I hope may throw some light on the subject.

As Sanskrit literature is wholly destitute of trustworthy geographical records, it is not easy, after the lapse of ages, to ascertain precisely the site of several places enumerated in the *Puráṇas*. A skilful conjecture only may be made by way of solving the problems of such a nature.

The *ṣloka* referred to in the letter is :—

उपप्लवं समागत्य क्लृप्त्वावारं प्रविश्य च ।  
पाण्डवानथ तान् सर्वान् शल्यस्तत्र ददर्श ह ॥

“*Śalya* having arrived at *Upaplava* entered the camp and saw there all the *Páṇḍavas*.”

*Nílakanṭha* in his commentary on this *ṣloka* says—उपप्लवं विराटनगरस्य प्रदेशविशेषम् “*Upaplava* is a city in the kingdom of *Viráṭa*” (*Matsyadeśa*). So the solution of the question solely depends on finding out the site of *Matsyadeśa* or the kingdom of *Viráṭa*, a task which is as difficult as may be expected at a time like this when all the geographical names of ancient India have assumed quite different forms.

However, we must try to trace the place by collecting local traditions as well as *Paurāṇika* descriptions relating to the subject.

It is a common saying among the people of *Midanapur* district in *Bengal* that, the *Matsyadeśa* of ancient times had been situated in the vicinity of that district, while others state that the kingdom of *Viráṭa* had

been situate near the Maldah district in Northern Bengal ; and both parties show some ruins to verify their respective theories.\*

I found the other day in a Bengali Map of India by a Ganeṣachandra Bhaṭṭacharjya that Berar of the present time was marked as the kingdom of Virāṭa of the Mahābhārata. According to the Prākṛita Grammar the word Virāṭa in Sanskrit might be reduced to the form of Birāḍa in the Prākṛita, hence Birāra or Berar in the vernaculars. So this last supposition has a strong etymological ground to support it.

The traditions and hypotheses cited above are apparently of such a contradictory nature that from them not much light can be derived. So leaving them aside for a moment, let us search in the Mahābhārata after the districts bordering on Matsyadeṣa.

We find in the Digvijaya Parvādhyāya, of Sabhāparva, Mahābhārata :—

विजित्याल्पेन कालेन दशार्णानजयत् प्रभुः ।  
तत्र दशार्णको राजा सुधर्मा लोमहर्षणम् ।  
कृतवान् भीमसेनेन सहद् युद्धं निरायुधम् ।  
युध्यमानं बलात् सङ्घे विजिग्ये पाण्डवर्षभः ।  
ततो मत्स्यान् महातेजा मलदांस्व महाबलान् ॥

“That Bhima on his way to conquer the eastern countries, having subdued many countries, in a short time came to Daṣārṇa, where Sudhar-mā the king of the place fought a dreadful battle, but Bhima gained the field. After completing the conquest of this country, the very powerful Bhima subdued the inhabitants of Matsya and Malada respectively.”

It is manifest from the above that the Matsyadeṣa of Mahābhārata had Daṣārṇa on one side and Malada on the other. But this, instead of solving the problem, leads us to a greater confusion. Now the question arises where was Daṣārṇa situated, and where Malada? On the reply to this depends our solution, but this is not an easy task.

Mr. Wilson, in his commentary on the 24th śloka of Meghadūta re-cites the following in respect of Daṣārṇa :

“No traces of this name are to be found in modern maps. It is enumerated in Major Wilford’s lists from the Purānas, Asiatic Researches, Vol. VIII, amongst the countries situated behind the Vindhya mountains and corresponds according to him with Daseréne of Ptolemy’s. \* \* \* \* It may possibly correspond, at least in part, with the modern district of Chattisgarh,

\* [This is a mistake, according to Dr. R. Mitra, who thinks “that the Paṇḍit must have confounded Midnapur with Dinajpur which has often been described as the Virāṭa of the Mahābhārata.” See *Proceedings, A. S. B.*, August 1880. On the identification of Virāṭa, see General Cunningham’s *Ancient Geography of India*, vol. I. p. 350. Ed.]

as the etymology of both words refers to similar circumstances, Chattisgarh being so named from its being supposed to comprise thirty-six forts. According to Bharata the commentator on our text, Daśārṇa is derived from Daśa ten and Rīna a stronghold or Durga of the Peninsula and hence means the district of the ten citadels.”

If we rely on the above a part of the question is solved. Let us now look after Malada.

In his commentary on the 15th śloka of Meghadūta in which a term *Mala* occurred, Mr. Wilson observes that “the easterly progress of the cloud and the subsequent direction by which he is to reach the mountain A'mra-cūta, prove that the place here mentioned must be somewhere in the immediate vicinity of Ruttanpore, the chief town of the northern half of the province of Chattisgarh and described in Captain Blunt's tour, Asiatic Researches, Vol. II, the only modern traces that can be found of it are in a plane called Malda, a little to the north of Ruttanpore; in Ptolemy's map there is a town called Maleta and situated with respect to the Vindya mountains similarly with the Mala of our poet.”

Many places may be found in the map of India under the name of Mala or Malwa. A term which according to the Prākṛita Grammar may be supposed to have been derived from the Sanskrit Malada. Mr. Wilford in his lists from the Purāṇas has applied this name to the Malaboom of Midanapur, Bengal, while according to Pliny Malas are the countries of the Mali of the Punjab, a tribe who are described to have fought a dreadful battle with Alexander the Great. Besides these, a district of the same name, as we have already mentioned, is still to be found in northern Bengal.

This being the case, nothing can be precisely determined by merely saying that Matsyadeśa was situated between Daśārṇa and Malada; for we cannot ascertain which of the above mentioned places is meant here. (1) If Malaboom of Midanapur be taken for it, the first tradition may be deemed acceptable. (2) If Maldah of Bengal be considered to have been the Malada of the text, it would furnish a strong argument in support of the second. (3) If we concur with Mr. Wilson, the place so described in the Bengali map might be considered as possibly a correct one. So the solution still is enveloped in hopeless confusion.

Let us adopt another way which may lead us to the correct place.

Manu in his division of India states:—

“सरस्वतीदृषद्वत्योर्देवनद्योर्दन्तरम् ।  
तं देवनिर्मितं देशं ब्रह्मावर्त्तं प्रचक्षते ॥  
कुरुक्षेत्रं च मत्स्याश्च पाञ्चालाः शूरसेनकाः ।  
एष ब्रह्मर्षिदेशो वै ब्रह्मावर्त्तादनन्तरः ॥”

“The sacred place lying between the two divine rivers Saraswatī and Dṛishadwatī (Gagra) is called Brahmāvarta, and next to Brahmāvarta is Brahmarshideṣa, a place consisting of Kurukshetra, Matsya, Pānchāla, and Śúrasenaka.”

*Kullúkabhāṭṭa*, in his commentary on the last śloka, says “मत्स्यादिशब्दा बह्वचनान्ता देशविशेषवाचकाः—पाञ्चालाः कान्यकुब्जदेशाः शूरसेनका मथुरादेशाः” “The words Matsya &c., when used as plural, denote the countries of the same names. Pānchāla is the name of Kānyakubjadeṣa and Śúrasena of Mathurá.”

It would be out of place here to discuss whether Pānchāla and Kānyakubja are two different names of the same place. Yet it may be safely inferred that even at the time of *Kullúkabhāṭṭa* the names of the places mentioned in the old books must have become obsolete, otherwise Kullukabhāṭṭa would have pointed out the modern name of Matsya. Nevertheless it is evident from the above mentioned passage of Manu that Matsya Deṣa was situate next to Kurukshetra in the Ambala district and was probably on the south-east of it.

Again we find in Virāṭaparva, Mahābhārata—the way of the Pāṇḍavas from Kāmyavana—a forest extending on the banks of the Saraswatī—to Matsyadeṣa is described as follows :—

“उत्तरेण दशार्णांस्ते पाञ्चालान् दक्षिणेन च ।  
अन्तरेण यद्वह्नीमान् शूरसेनांश्च पाण्डवाः ।  
लुब्धा ब्रुवाणा मत्स्यस्य विषयं प्राविशन् वनात् ॥”

“Pāṇḍavas calling themselves hunters and going straight by north of Daśārṇa, south of Pānchāla and through Yakrilloma and Śúrasena reached the kingdom of Matsya.” From this passage we may easily infer that Matsyadeṣa must have been situate on the north-west of Śúrasena (modern Mathurá), a place nearly corresponding with that of Manu.

Moreover it is mentioned in the Gograhaparvādhāya, Virāṭaparva of the Mahābhārata, that Matsyadeṣa was situated on the south-east of Hastinapur, then the capital of India, and was at a distance of two days' journey from it, thus :—

“ते तु गत्वा यथोद्दिष्टां दिशं वक्त्रेर्महीपते ।  
सन्नद्धा रथिनः सर्व्वे सपादाता बलात्कराः ।  
प्रतिवैरं चिकीर्षन्तो गोषु गृह्णा म्हाव्रताः ।  
अपरे दिवसे सर्व्वे राजन् समूय कौरवाः ।  
अष्टम्यां ते न्यगृह्णन्त गोकुलानि सहस्रशः ॥”

A place called Hathnapore in the Mirut district is supposed to be the Hastinapore of the Mahābhārata. This supposition also, if correct, supports our point. On the whole we may be satisfied that Matsyadeṣa must have

been situated between Mathurá and Delhi, and consequently the Paṇḍits who claim that Upello on the Delhi and Agra road was the Upaplava of ancient times may be quite correct.

As regards Daśárṇa, although we have not any strong argument on our side to refute Mr. Wilson, yet we may freely urge that there was a Daśárṇa in the north-western Provinces; for a river of the same name is still to be found in the Hamirpur district, North-West Provinces.

With respect to Malada it is true that no definite trace of it is to be found now. Nevertheless we must consider it to have been situated in the North-Western Provinces. There is a place in the Delhi district called Malwa, from which a large quantity of oil is exported to various provinces of Hindustan. I may throw out the suggestion that this Malwa may be the Malada of the Mahábhárata. If this be the case we have got a consistent theory which may be provisionally accepted as true until some better one be found in its place.

~~~~~

Translations from the Hamáseh.—By C. J. LYALL, C. S.

In the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal for 1877 I published some translations of old Arabian poetry, chiefly from the *Hamáseh*, and the following are offered in continuation of those. Somewhat more exactness of metrical form has now been aimed at in the English versions, but I hope that accuracy has not been allowed thereby to suffer. The majority of the poems have been translated in Arabian metres, a full explanation of each of which will be found where it occurs. A critic in the *Academy*, noticing the previous series, has called in question the possibility of giving in the English language any idea of Arab metres, or at least the adequacy of the attempt made in that series. On that occasion, however, I aimed (with one exception) at no exact reproduction in English of the order and quantity of the syllables in the Arabic originals: only a general likeness was intended; and that likeness seemed to me to be sufficiently secured. I may mention that I have carefully studied M. Stanislas Guyard's *Théorie Nouvelle de la Métrique Arabe*, and that any discrepancy which may be detected between his views on the Arabian metres and mine is not due to my ignorance of the former. The four metres which I have imitated in the translations are the *Ṭawíl*, the *Hezej*, the *Kámil*, and the *Wáfir* (the last exactly only in one poem, No. III: in Nos. XV and XXII only the general scheme is followed).